

To: Gray, David[gray.david@epa.gov]
Cc: Smith, Paula[Smith.Paula@epa.gov]; Zito, Kelly[ZITO.KELLY@EPA.GOV]; Harrison, Melissa[Harrison.Melissa@epa.gov]
From: Purchia, Liz
Sent: Sun 8/9/2015 11:59:03 PM
Subject: Re: GoldKingMine_August 9_Statement.do

adding Melissa

Can we scratch this? I don't think we have to proactively bring it up again.

We acknowledge frustration with the turnaround time for this information.

Can we add info on the claims process?

And can we include any of the messages from the comments from Shaun and Debra's opening remarks where they address the current situation and she gives an overview of the data? Here are my notes on that.

Mine site – same discharges as yesterday, 500 gallons/minute

Pre release volume around 200 gallons/min, still above pre-event discharge

Treatment ponds up and running, treating as it comes out of mine, treatment seems to be successful in acidity and settlement of metals

Releasing soon a revised volume estimate of the discharge at the time of the event wed/thurs

Estimate originally 1 mil gallons, became aware of USGS stream gauge on cement creek, last couple days working with them for better number, preliminary number, more range of 3 mill gallons

Will be making public on website soon

Plume – aspect aircraft out there today, leading edge is starting to diminish in its visibility from the aircraft, still visible on the ground, but showing that from Montezuma creek up to Farmington, water starting to return to normal coloration

These were my notes on the Data from Debra's opening comments.

Data – made available data sheet that describe conclusions from metals analysis from samples Aug 5 and 6

A list of metal constituents we found in samples as well as number associated with constituent

Publishing data which shows from cement creek and down animus – fortunate to have sampling teams on site, so took water samples pretty closely to time incident occurred.

Data shows that before the plume reaches a sampling location – metals concentration at historic levels, as plume passes concentration increases for a few hours and then decreases again

Follow the plume as it travels down, taken samples as plume approaches Durango and beyond

Will publish in the next day or so

Had comms w local CO extension officer, conferred with us relative to health of wildlife and livestock – both concluded that bc plume moved quickly that even if they had some of it to drink that the volume of water wouldn't have caused longterm health effects

Conferred w toxicologists in 6 and 9 and developing human health based screening criteria that we'll be using to monitor the data and it will be available

Evaluating other water criteria that indicate protectiveness for wildlife

Residents along the animus w drinking water wells near river, some of indicated discoloration, we are sending sampling teams to those locations to determine quality of water and being provided with alternate sources of water.

Liz Purchia
U.S. EPA
202-564-6691
202-841-2230

On Aug 9, 2015, at 7:49 PM, Gray, David <gray.david@epa.gov> wrote:

Hold I have comments

From: Smith, Paula
Sent: Sunday, August 09, 2015 6:46 PM
To: Purchia, Liz; Gray, David; Zito, Kelly
Subject: Fwd: GoldKingMine_August 9_Statement.do

For your quick review. Thx.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Schuller, Jennifer" <Schuller.Jennifer@epa.gov>

Date: August 9, 2015 at 5:44:54 PM MDT

To: "Smith, Paula" <Smith.Paula@epa.gov>

Subject: GoldKingMine_August 9_Statement.docx